United STAtes Marshall PayNE 1:20-cr-000z4-1 HONORable Judge Marish S. Shah, WELL I KNOW it's probably to late to appeal my sentence but I just NEED to let you know what happen all my case MR. GREEN BERG 3 the PROSECUTOR, which was untain 3 Defindants like me who out our live in the hands of attorneu's who sell us out for whatever leason SUDDOSE to trust them because they did all that so that know nothing about the law but what are use WE find out that WE ARE Just wother Case that wants to get off his fesk's Now I want und to know teel that the 48 months you gave me were fair bases auntelise's that were aresented in your co dishit sian to those and elise's even though I do so twice. I didn't like those guidelines so I was set trial 3 my Attorney Mr. Greenberg KNEW I wisn't going SIGN the flee Agreement for 51-63 months so I who that into my state case to see if I could get it over turned (Exhibit A) emailow (04-04-2022 at 6:52 pm Clearly as here what's doing on with my state case, to 8 days later (04/12-2022 at 5:06 pm), telling ME 1 wrong transcript for A stakie case Also in the you see AM. Green hero tell me to plea out to the plea th REplied 2 hours later on (04-02-2022 at 7:05,5m), tell him Im Not LOOKES INTO WAS CONE. ON 105-05-2022 A

Case: 1:20-cr-00024 Document #: 103 Filed: 11/15/22 Page 1 of 13 PageID #:993

Case: 1:20-cr-00024 Document #: 103 Filed: 11/15/22 Page 2 of 13 PageID #:994	
gradiana.	
	>
	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
	A contract of the contract of
·	
FILED	
NOV 1 = 2000 SAAR	
NOV 15 2022 SMB	
THOMAS G. BRUTON CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
	1

Case: 1:20-cr-00024 Document #: 103 Filed: 11/15/22 Page 3 of 13 PageID #:995 Nothing back from him? I was assuming we were going to trial that we receded to talk so we can start preparing for and that I had a few things that I feel will help my Case. Also that I didn't usent to wait til the last minute. And could be get IN contact with me ASAP. MR. GREENBERG REDIED ON the same day 65-05-2022 at 10:36 am) to which he claimed that I had heard back from him 3 he had no idea what I was talking about HE claimed that he had ordered the transcript's from the plea 3 he was waiting. Mr Greenberg went on to tell me that I can go to trial if I wanted to go but that would be foolish. (Exhibit B) I had NO Emails between (04-18-2022 at 4:30 pm til 05-05-2022) tron Steve Greenberg or No phone calls either. These are all RECORDS that CON DE Obtained from (Mcc Chicago) I go and to tell Mr. Greenberg that I had heard from him IN 2 weeks what I asked him to theck with the Rosewice to see what was their Position in waiving my Juvenile from my P.S.I Since it was A misdeeminer. I went on to tell him I was going to do what I see lit "I have to do the time so I'm going to make the decision on what to do 3 as Dua as he And his best that's all I care about (Also in Exhibit B) (05-06-2022 at 1:14,0m) TEN days latter on (05-16-2022 at 8:19am) I emailed MR. GREEN BERG telling him I wanted him to subposer all the police's body cand that wege in the same unit, GPS into for their Car, Any Complaint's filed on both officers, Acopy of what time they Ran MY NAME 3 FROM WHERE WERE they also when chil they RUN the vehicle into 3 that I needed to send an investigator

out to talk to a possible withess. (exhibit C) To which I received a reply 4 hours loter (05-16-2022At 12:36pm), telling me that he had all the discovery he weeded to litioate my case. That I was looking at 30-37 months. That he was Joing to to revoked me the plea. That he assume I was going to sign the plea agreement since that is exactly what Teliscussed with him (exhibit C) Mr. Greenberg Affirmed me that the plea process is exercistized sky with mittiple layers of Review by the bosses (exhibit) with the process being as it is it hand to believe that many PEOPLE OVER looked the fact that the (Case number doesn't match 3 he had telowers spound the late I was bowl. (SEE Exhibit E) FELONIES IN 1983 FOR ROBBERY, 1983 FOR BURG BRU 1990 for Possession of Conteolled substance. As Well, the probation officer who does the P.S.R. didn't see a problem with her investigation which is why she recomended 37 months. I find it had to believe that this was overlooked by many professional PERSONAL AND WAS ONLY RAISED AFTER I SIGNED AND THE P.S.I CAME back. With that being said I believe this was done intentioned because prior to me signing the plea agreement I kept danging the plea agreement they presented to me the prior two limit of 51-63 months I was planning to take this case to trial UNTIL the agreement presented the NEW plea of 30-37 months. Which is what all parties agreed to and PSI came back within those quideline's as well. There was Plain ERROR that accurred in this court when the government breached the pled agreement and the breach prejudiced me and seriously affected the integrity, fairness, and public reputation of the

	ase: 1:20-cr-00024 Document #: 103 Filed: 11/15/22 Page 5 of 13 PageID #:997	
`		
•	proceedings. The government breached it promise in the plea agreement to recommend a sentence within the quideline Range by advocating for an above -quidelines sentence. For these real the race that was plain occurred here, and the export affect my substantial rights. (U.S. v. Malone, 20-12744, (144 cir. October 2022))	to bacones
	DECCEPTINGS. THE GOVERNMENT breached it promise in the plea	
	more ment to commend a sentence within the andeline Roma	
	hu showful to 2 1 show and lives so to year for those sen	
	III I I COOK - GUINETINES SENTENCE, OR WASE LES	Jan
	THE ENOR that was plain occurred here, and the export affect	m
	My substential rights. (U.S. V. Malone, 20-12744, (11th cir. October 2	76 ,
	262Z)) ·	
	United States	
	Marshall PayNE	
	1 JORSTALL JOHNE	-
	1:20cr00024-1	

```
1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )
                         SS:
 2 COUNTY OF C O O K )
 3
          IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
              COUNTY DEPARTMENT - CRIMINAL DIVISION
 4
                    SECOND MUNICIPAL DISTRICT
   THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
    OF ILLINOIS,
 6
                  Plaintiff,
 7
                                  No. 02 CR 232589
        VS.
 8
 9
   MARSHALL PAYNE,
10
                  Defendant.
                  EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing
11
12 in the above-entitled cause before the HONORABLE
   SHELLEY SUTKER-DERMER, Judge of said court, on the 4th
13
   day of April, 2003.
14
15
        APPEARANCES:
16
        HONORABLE RICHARD A. DEVINE,
        STATE'S ATTORNEY OF COOK COUNTY, by:
17
        MR. CHRISTOPHER PFANNKUCHE,
        ASSISTANT STATE'S ATTORNEY,
             Appeared on behalf of the People;
18
19
        MR. EDWIN A. BURNETTE,
        PUBLIC DEFENDER OF COOK COUNTY, by:
20
        MR. ANDREW E. SOHN,
        ASSISTANT PUBLIC DEFENDER,
             Appeared on behalf of the Defendant.
21
22
23
    TRACI L. PANKEY, C.S.R.
24 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
    License No. #084-003980
                                1
```

(Exhabit E) lof 6

1	* * * * *
2	(Whereupon there were proceedings had
3	that were not transcribed)
4	THE COURT: Evidence in this case did not support
5	intent. Although the State argued it did, there is no
6	indication there is intent.
7	Question is, is there sufficient evidence to
8	prove beyond a reasonable doubt Defendant possessed
9	heroin or controlled substance on date of the offense.
10	The issue here is whether State has met
11	their burden of proof. Defense would say story is so
12	preposterous State could not based on evidence of the
13	officers prove beyond a reasonable doubt Defendant had,
14	in fact, possession of narcotics in plastic bag and
15	stuffed it in a wall, in brick area, and State would
16	argue it has argued the Defendant's story is
17	preposterous in the way he got arrested.
18	Not only did he get arrested in a way that
19	indicated they had nothing on him, they had to figure
20	it out at station, and at station they put the drug
21	case on him. When they were on call, apparently by his
22	testimony, for some type of fight.
23	I obviously have the job of weighing
24	credibility of the witnesses. This Court finds in

- 1 favor of the State. In terms of the officers'
- 2 testimony. Impeachment of whether it was I clearly
- 3 believe officer in the writing as opposed to the
- 4 (unreadable steno) for impeaching the officers'
- 5 testimony. When it indicated four packets; and, if
- 6 anything, if they were to going to put it on him, make
- 7 up entire story, they're not going to put 16 packets
- 8 down inventory form. In any event, I will indicate I
- 9 did believe testimony of the officers things
- 10 (unreadable steno). He was credible.
- And I am finding Defendant guilty of Class 4
- 12 felony possession of controlled substance. I will
- 13 order pre-sentence investigation, bring this case back
- 14 here for May 2nd for purposes of sentencing. What that
- 15 means, somebody will interview you from the Social
- 16 Services Department. I am not sure if they will do it
- 17 at this point in the afternoon, or I have to bring you
- 18 back another date.
- 19 State?
- MR. PFANNKUCHE: At this time, I know Defendant is
- 21 in custody. Should he make bond, I ask Court revoke
- 22 his bond. He has now been found guilty by this Court.
- 23 He has, for the record, if I may?
- 24 THE COURT: No. I know he has two felony

Exhibit E 30f6

- 1 convictions.
- MR. PFANNKUCHE: He has more than that, Judge. I
- 3 would like to apprise the Court of his background.
- 4 Defendant has at this point felony
- 5 conviction Class 2 for delivery of controlled
- 6 substance. October 23rd, 1998. Defendant has felony
- 7 conviction for robbery, January 13, 1995. Defendant
- 8 has -- that was penitentiary time to both of those.
- 9 Defendant has felony conviction for
- 10 possession of controlled substance, November 13, 1990,
- 11 penitentiary time. Defendant has felony conviction for
- 12 burglary, August 1st, 1983. Class 2 felony again,
- 13 penitentiary time. Defendant has felony conviction for
- 14 robbery, August 1st, 1983, penitentiary time.
- MR. SOHN: Can we say in the last 20 years.
- 16 THE COURT: That is within last 20 years because he
- 17 was sentenced. Anything else?
- 18 MR. PFANNKUCHE: I am stopping at this point.
- 19 THE COURT: Motion to revoke bond granted, unless
- 20 you wish to respond to that. Your client appears to be
- 21 in custody?
- MR. SOHN: Yes, Judge.
- 23 THE COURT: Motion to revoke bond granted.
- 24 MR. SOHN: We are asking for TASC evaluation.

```
1
         THE COURT: Based on your (unreadable steno) to
 2
    change date, continued it to (unreadable steno) you go
 3
    by agreement for purposes of post-trial motions you can
    file them it would have to be May 8 for purposes of
 5
    sentencing with TASC evaluation. I will order TASC
 6
    evaluation.
 7
         MR. PFANNKUCHE: By agreement May 8.
         THE COURT: It will be order of Court, May 8 for
 9
    purposes of sentencing and post-trial motions. Wish to
10
    file them, file them before that date. Do you have any
11
    objection to that being date he needs to be sentenced
12
    30 days. We will make it May 8. You wish to file them
13
    file them that date. There is no way to get
14
    pre-sentencing investigation or TASC evaluation prior
15
    to 30 days. That is the order.
16
                  (Whereupon, the above-entitled cause was
17
                  continued to May 8, 2003.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

5

1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2	COUNTY OF C O O K)
3	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
4	COUNTY DEPARTMENT-CRIMINAL DIVISION SECOND MUNICIPAL DISTRICT
5	
6	I, Traci L. Pankey, Certified Shorthand
7	Reporter for the Circuit Court of Cook County, do
8	hereby certify that I transcribed to the best of my
9	ability, the foregoing Report of Proceedings from the
10	notes of MARGO DEPHILLIPS, a Certified Shorthand
11	Reporter, and that the foregoing is a true and correct
12	transcript of said Report of Proceedings as appears
13	from the stenotype notes had before the Honorable
14	SHELLEY SUTKER-DERMER, Judge of said Court.
15	\mathcal{A} . A \mathcal{A}
16	Traci & Pankey, Clk
17	Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 084-003980
18	
19	
20	Dated this 5th
21	of May, 2022
22	
23	
24	

BOBO4#1702 COOS Honorable Judge Manish S. Sheh 2195. Dearborn Thicago IL 60604

METROPOLITAN CORRECTIONAL CENTER 71 W. VAN BUREN ST, CHICAGO, IL 60605 you may wish to return the material for further information or clarifier ion. The enclosed letter was processed through special mailing procedures for forwarding to you if the writer raises a question or problem over which this facility has jurisdiction. If the writer encloses correspondence for forwarding to another addressed. This letter has neither been opened nor inspected please return the enclosure to the above address. NOV 0 9 2022

-00024 Document #: 103 Filed: 11/15/22 Page 13 of 13